

Salve Regina University

## Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

---

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

---

2-2-2012

### Faculty Assembly Minutes, 2-2-12

Salve Regina University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac\\_assembly](https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Salve Regina University, "Faculty Assembly Minutes, 2-2-12" (2012). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. 265.  
[https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac\\_assembly/265](https://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/265)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff at Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Assembly Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@salve.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@salve.edu).

**Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes**  
**February 2<sup>nd</sup> 2012**  
**O'Hare Academic Center, Room 160**

The meeting was called to order at 2:38 PM. Faculty used the clickers to check in.

1. The Faculty Assembly meeting minutes from December 7th, 2012 were approved as written.

2. Reports and Announcements

Opening remarks (James Mitchell). Dr. Mitchell encouraged all faculty to support their colleagues by participating and attending the CTL symposium.

Treasurer's Report (Craig Condella). Dr. Condella announced that there was approximately \$1380 in the Faculty Assembly fund. The fund is used for the end of the year party, gifts for faculty and staff that have undergone a major life event, and other business for the Faculty Assembly. Dr. Condella encouraged faculty to pay their dues (\$20). He also announced that he was working with the social committee to plan a faculty party for March.

Core Curriculum Task Force (Alison Shakarian). Dr. Shakarian was announced as the chair of the core curriculum task force. Dr. Shakarian listed the members of the task force and reiterated that there was faculty representation for each department and discipline. She identified the charge of the task force, which is the following:

1. Review current core curriculum and report to faculty assembly
2. Develop core curriculum learning goals
3. Development of a draft core curriculum

Dr. Shakarian announced that the task force was presently in the process of collecting data for the first charge. The task force is utilizing data collected from the senior survey, NSSE, alumni survey and accepted student questionnaire, and is also developing new survey mechanisms to acquire the faculty input. The group is also exploring best practices at other institutions. Regular updates will be presented at the Faculty Assembly meeting as information is collected. The Faculty Assembly will be solicited for approval as core curriculum learning goals and models are drafted.

NCAA Division III Athletics Week (John Rok). John Rok reported on the fall 2011 report card for the academic progress of the student athletes (material distributed). He also reported that Division III student athlete week to be celebrated in April. Mr Rok recognized the faculty that currently serve as faculty mentors and encouraged others to participate.

Revised Academic Vision (Provost de la Motte). Dr. de la Motte started his discussion with the faculty by highlighting the major points of the NEASC report. The report recommended continued accreditation for the University. Dr. de la Motte indicated the complete NEASC final report will be made available to the academic community on the academic affairs webpage.

Dr. de la Motte then summarized the concerns of the faculty that were raised about the academic vision that resulted from the Provost's solicitation of responses. He indicated that one of the recurrent comments in the vision was in reference to the phrase "meeting students where they are". Dr de la Motte explained that this was a reference about recognizing academic diversity and not about being remedial. He also indicated that another common thread was the reference to the term "distinctive" and reassured faculty that this phrase is in reference to understanding the unique features of the University that draw students to the campus. Dr. de la Motte also indicated that questions were raised

about content, interdisciplinary and pedagogy. Dr. de la Motte also reiterated the value and importance of the core curriculum and its ability to examine enduring questions.

Survey on increasing the add/drop period (James Mitchell). Dr. Mitchell shared the results of an informal faculty survey concerning the amount of time available for add/drop. It appeared that the faculty were split in their opinions about changing the existing amount of time for add/drop.

Increase amount of time for add/drop (Lisa Zuccarelli). Dr. Zuccarelli presented the motion to extend the add/drop period. There was no discussion about the motion which was defeated 25-yes, 42-no, 1-abstention.

Curriculum Committee: Two different proposals were subject to faculty review. Faculty discussion ensued about the necessity to have a curriculum committee over the existing system. Questions were raised about the logistics of the proposals and the speed at which changes could be made to courses could be a problem. Other faculty raised a concern about the individuals reviewing course changes that are not experts in their field. It was noted that it is standard practice by many institutions to have a curriculum committee to review and approve all changes made to the curriculum. Faculty also noted that increasing interdisciplinary programs would benefit from an institution perspective. The discussion was tabled until the March meeting to provide faculty with additional opportunities to evaluate the two proposals.

Faculty Emeritus Status document was not discussed

The Faculty Assembly meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM.